

MAHARASTRA STATE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CO. LTD.

KONKAN ZONE RATNAGIRI

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum Ratnagiri

Consumer case No. – 17 /2013

Date :- 26.04.2013

**Mr. Pramod Vijay Gudekar.
H.No. 339,Rahatagar Wadi.
A/P Malgund
Tal- Ratnagiri, Dist- Ratnagiri**

}

Complainant

V/S

**Executive Engineer
Maharashtra State Elec.Dist.Co.Ltd.
Ratnagiri**

}

Opposite Party

Quorum of the Forum

}

- 1) Mr. D. S. Jamkhedkar
Chairman**
- 2) Mr. V.B.Jagtap.
Secretary Member**
- 3) Mr. N. A. Kulkarni
Member**

On behalf of consumer

-

Absent

On behalf of opposite party

}

- 1) Mr. M.S.Kanade.
Jr.Manager(F &A)**

Redressal Forum and Ombudsman Regulation 2003 Vide Clause No.8.2

Present complaint has been filed by complainant who is having domestic connection bearing No. 210120010489 for his residential house at Rahatagar Tal & Dist Ratnagiri

1) According to the complaint, prior to October 2012, the system of issuing quarterly bill was in vogue but thereafter Mahavitrans started issuing monthly bills. Two such bills of October 2012 and Nov 2012 were issued to him on average basis (for 151 units) stating on the bill that door locked and reading not available. Then in Dec. 2012, the bill of Dec. 2012 was issued to him for 179 units which was excessive and the same was tried to be recovered. alongwith bill of oct 12 & Nov. 2012. This action of Mahavitrans has been challenged.

Then sufficient period has also not been given for paying bills and penalties were recovered appears to be the second grievance

For redressal of these two grievances the consumer has filed this petition.

2) In response to the notice, Mahavitrans has filed say on 1.6.2013.

Mahavitrans has come out with the case that for October 2012 and November 2012 the readings were not available as the door was locked and so as per provisions of Regulation No. 15.3.1 bills based on average reading were issued and when the reading for Dec.12 i.e. billing period 25.11.12 to 25.12.12 was available, the bill was issued in accordance with the provision of Regulation 15.3.1 of MERC (Electric Supply Code and other conditions of supply) Regulation 2005.

According to Mahavitrans, the bill of Dec. 2012 issued in Jan 2013 is correct and proper and requires no interference. so the complaint be dismissed.

Complainant could not appear personally on the date of hearing and - Intimated that the papers produced by him be taken into consideration.

Mahavitrans also relied on the reply filed to the grievance.

3) In view of rival submissions, following points arise for our consideration and we have given the findings against each of them for the reasons given below.

No.	Points	Findings
1.	Whether bill of Dec 2012 is correct and proper.	Yes
2.	Whether it requires interference	No
3.	What order	As per final order

Reasons

4) Point No. 1 & 2 :-

Mahavitran has issued the bills of oct 2012 and Nov.2012 on average basis as the reading was not available as per the report of Meter reader. The bills show endorsement. 'RNA' and door locked. But the report of Meter reader appears to be false as the meter is on the outer wall and the reading could be had though the door of the house was locked.

But then, no injustice has been caused to the consumer in this case because the bills of October 2012 and Nov 2012 have been issued on average basis i.e. for 151 units each by taking into consideration consumption of last 6 months i.e. two quarters as the cycle earlier was quarterly. It is to be noted from the C.P.L. (Consumer's personal ledger) that consumer has not paid both these bills, as the last payment appears to have been made on 1.10.2012 for bill issued in Sept. 2012

Then the Mahavitran has issued disputed bill of 179 units (for the period 25.09.2012 to 24.10.2012, 25.10.2012 to 25.11.2012 and 25.11.2012 to 24.12.2012) on 15.01.2013. This bill has been assailed by consumer before the forum.

If we look to the bill and the calculated amount, then we find that the provision of Regulation 15.3.1 of MERC (Electric Supply Code and other conditions of Supply) Regulation 2005 has been Meticulously followed by Mahavitran and there is absolutely no fault in issuing the bill. The average consumptions of 151 units and charges thereof are being taken into consideration by Mahavitran and it must be said that the bill dated 15.1.2013 impugned before this forum is completely faultless. so it must be said that bill is correct and proper.

The Query made by consumer as to how 151 units were calculated in earlier two bills is also rightly answered by Mahavitran in the say filed on record. These bills are issued on the basis of average consumption of earleier two quarters as the billing was on quarterly basis.

With this, it must be said that the impugned bill dated 15.1.2013 is corret and proper. Required adjustments as per Regulation 15.3.1 referred supra are given in the said bill. so bill requires no interference

Hence, I answer point No.1 in the affirmative and point No.2 in the negative.

5) Point No 3 :-

In the result the complaint deserves rejection.Hence we proceed to pass following order.

Order

- 1) **The Grievances of the consumer stand rejected.**
- 2) **In case consumer desires to appeal against this order he should file his appeal to the following addresses.**

Secretary,

**OMBUDSMAN, Maharashtra State Electricity Regulatory Commission,
606/608, Keshava Building,**

Bandra Kurla Complex,

Mumbai – 400 051.

Phone No.022 – 2659 2965.

**D.S.Jamkhedkar
Chairman ,C.G.R.F
Konkan Zone**

**V.B.Jagtap
Ex.Engineer,C.G.R.F
Konkan Zone**

**N.A.Kulkarni
Member,C.G.R.F
Konkan Zone**

Date : 03.07.2013

Place : Ratnagiri

